

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Office Action of February 16, 2007. This request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

AMENDMENT FOR OBJECTION AND REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112

Paragraphs [0040], [0067], Claim 10, and Claim 11 were amended to comply with the Examiner's objections. Also, Claims 10 and 11 were amended to comply with the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC §112. All amendments made herein are to correct minor grammatical errors or for clarification purpose. No new matter has been added.

AMENDMENT BY APPLICANT

Paragraph [0030] was amended by Applicant to correct FIG. 1 to TABLE 1 and also to add TABLE 1 at the end of this paragraph. The translation error of TABLE 1 was obvious as FIG. 1 does not show what is described in this paragraph. Contents in the added TABLE 1 are simply repetition of what is described in this paragraph and clearly described in this paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Paragraph [0052] was amended by Applicant to add the title of this paragraph to comply with the formality of the rest of the specification. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102 FOR CLAIMS 1-5 (Uchida)

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 USC. §102 by US5,694,019 to Uchida. The Examiner suggested that Uchida discloses "a battery charging apparatus which has a battery charging unit (31); a battery information reading unit (28) with a display unit (16) and output battery information reading unit (34); and a controller (20), and Claim 1 can be anticipated by this disclosure. The Examiner also suggested that Uchida discloses the battery charging apparatus which has a central processing unit (21), a battery information reading unit (28) with a display unit (16) and an output battery information reading unit (34), and a network management apparatus (2), and Claim 2 can be anticipated by this disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to lines 60-63, column 6 of Uchida, the controller (20) displays an error message by display unit (16) and controls outputting the inserted card...the controller (20) controls moving the shutter drive unit (29) for opening the battery entrance port (12)". On the other hand, Claim 1 of the present invention is a charging system for a rapid charge battery, comprising: a charging equipment for said rapid charge battery; a measurement display unit which measures deterioration and charging level of said rapid charge battery; and a fee collection device which collects a battery charging fee.

Here, the display unit (16) of Uchida is to display an error message if the inserted battery 4 is determined not registered. Based on that determination, the controller (20) controls outputting the inserted card and moving the stoppers (281,

341) and driving the door (41) for outputting the inserted battery. The measurement display unit of the present invention is to measure deterioration and charging level of the rapid charge battery. Therefore, the object, function, and display results of Uchida and the present invention are different, and the present invention should not be anticipated by Uchida.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC §102. The Examiner suggested that Uchida discloses the battery charging apparatus which has a CPU (21), a ROM (22), a RAM (23), a MODEM (24), a network control unit (25), a card access unit (26), a battery detecting unit (27), a battery information reading unit (28), an energy discharging unit (35), a shutter drive unit (29), a door drive unit (30), a battery charging unit (31), a timer (32), a solenoid drive unit (33), and a display unit (16), and an output battery information reading unit (34), and Claim 3 can be anticipated by this disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The most sophisticated feature of Claim 3 is a function to notify the user via the charging processor when the deterioration of the rapid charge battery goes below the predetermined level. Paragraph [0031] of the present specification described the notification process where it states "if the deterioration is below the predetermined level, the control unit 22 will notify the measurement display unit 12 as to the degree of deterioration to further notify the user. Alternatively, the control unit 22 can transmit a trigger signal to the charger 11 so as to stop the charging. As such, controlling of the battery charging can be centralized. Therefore, the member may feel more secure about the system; allows easy

access of the existing battery problems to the service provider and this helps to improve battery technology.”

In Uchida, the controller (20) judges “whether the inserted battery can still be charged or not, whether its useful life is overlife is over...” (Column 7, Line 42+,) The battery ID table (222) stores a battery classification...and disposable information...” in ROM (205) and the NV RAM (209). (Column 6, Lines 35-41) However, Uchida does not disclose, teach or suggest the function of notifying the deterioration of the battery to the user for the above-specified purpose. In addition to the discussion above regarding Claims 1 and 2, this difference makes the present invention unique, and therefore Claim 3 should not be anticipated.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 4-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Uchida in view of US6835496 to Kaminaka et al. (Kaminaka). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Uchda in view of Kaminaka and further in view of US6459238 to Minamiura et al. Furthermore, Claims 12-15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Uchida in view of US6121751 to Merritt. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

For the same reasons stated above in the discussion of 35 USC 102, the present invention should not be obvious by using Uchida as the base reference.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is submitted that the amended Claims 1-15 define the invention over the prior art and notice to this effect is respectfully solicited. Applicant has either complied with all Examiner recommendations or has effectively argued against the Examiner's objections/rejections and believes that all currently pending claims are now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claimed language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

/Tracy M Heims/

Tracy M Heims

Apex Juris, pllc
Lake City Center, Suite 410
12360 Lake City Way Northeast
Seattle, WA 98125
Phone: 206-664-0314
Fax: 206-664-0329
Email: usa@apexjuris.com